NATIONAL RESEARCH UNIVERSITY

HIGHER SCHOOL OF ECONOMICS

INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

Oksana Dremova

Students` Criticism and Justification of Academic Dishonesty

Summary of the thesis

for the purpose of obtaining academic degree

Doctor of Philosophy in Education

Academic supervisor:

Natalia Maloshonok,

PhD

Moscow – 2022

The thesis was prepared at the National Research University Higher School of Economics.

Publications:

1. Dremova O.V. (2020). Russian University Policies on Students` Academic Dishonesty: Punishment or Ethical Training. *University Management: Practice and Analysis.* 24(4):30-45. (In Russ.) https://doi.org/10.15826/umpa.2020.04.033

2. Dremova O.V. (2020). Student academic dishonesty: Review of theoretical frameworks and methods of prevention. *Pedagogy and Psychology of Education*. 2:93-111. (In Russ.). https://doi.org/10.31862/2500-297X-2020-2-93-111

3. Dremova O. V., Maloshonok N. G., Terentiev E. A. (2020). Seeking Justice in Academia: Criticism and Justification of Student Academic Dishonesty. *Monitoring of Public Opinion: Economic and Social Changes*. 4: 366-394. (In Russ.) https://doi.org/10.14515/monitoring.2020.4.972.

4. Dremova, O., Maloshonok, N., Terentev, E., & Federiakin, D. (2021). Criticism and justification of undergraduate academic dishonesty: development and validation of the domestic, market and industrial orders of worth scales. *European Journal of Higher Education*, 1-18. https://doi.org/10.1080/21568235.2021.1987287

Other publications related to the dissertation topic:

1. Dremova O. V., Bekova S.K. (2021). University codes of ethics: what do they regulate and how? *Educational policies*. 1: 88-98 (In Russ.)

2. Timofeyev, Y., & Dremova, O. (2021). Ethical beliefs and behaviour of university educators: evidence from Russia. *Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education.* Vol. ahead-of-print No. ahead-of-print. https://doi.org/10.1108/JARHE-07-2020-0242

Conferences:

1. ECER: "National Differences in Students` Cheating Behaviour and its Justification at the University", Hamburg, Germany, 2019;

2. X International Conference for Higher Education Researchers: "Ways of Justification of Student Academic Dishonesty", Moscow, Russia, 2019.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

Research background

Academic dishonesty is a widespread problem for universities around the world. According to the research in the US, Europe and Russia, more than half of the students engaged in cheating to get a higher grade during their studies at the university (Ives & Giukin, 2020, Maloshonok & Shmeleva, 2019; Ives et al. 2017; Starovoytova & Namango 2016; Roschina, 2013; McCabe et al., 2001).

Academic misconduct leads to several negative consequences for both universities and society as a whole. Firstly, the high prevalence of academic fraud negatively affects the quality of graduate training (Magnus et al., 2002), and, as a result, reduces the value of higher education degrees (Starovoytova & Arimi, 2017) and employers' trust in universities (Cizek & Cizek, 2003). Secondly, students who cheat at universities are more likely to be engaged in unethical practices at their future workplaces, which negatively affect efficiency and economic development (Whitley et al., 2001).

At the moment, various universities have developed a series of measures aimed at combating students` academic dishonesty, for example, penalties (Starovoytova & Arimi, 2017); special lectures, courses, group discussions on academic integrity (Burr & King, 2012); honor codes (McCabe & Trevino, 1993; Macdonald & Carroll, 2006); student engagement in university ethics commissions (Doyle, 2010).

Recently, universities has shifted focus from the punitive to the holistic approach, aimed at the formation of academic integrity values among students. The implementation of honor codes becomes especially popular (Löfström et al., 2015). Although their effectiveness has not been proven yet, for example, experimental studies show a small and statistically insignificant effect of such honor codes (Corrigan-Gibbs et al., 2015).

In this dissertation, we assume that the low efficiency of the holistic approach may be explained by the fact that the developed honor codes are based on the assumption that not only university administration and faculty members, but also students perceive academic dishonesty as something "bad", "deviating from the norm" and "ethically unacceptable" regardless of the circumstances. While in reality, students may consider dishonest actions at the university as something natural, routine and acceptable (Stephens, 2019). They may also base their evaluation of academic misconduct not only on their

attitudes towards it but also on the conditions and characteristics of the situation in which specific dishonest actions will be or have already been performed (McCabe & Trevino, 1997).

This thesis is aimed at bridging the gap between the premises that university honor codes are based on, intending to form students` integrity values, and students' perception of dishonest practices at the university. This will be achieved through the development of a theoretical and methodological approach based on the student evaluation of the fairness of different situations in the university where dishonest actions took place. In this dissertation, we use the concepts and definitions that are accepted by the international research society. By the synonymous terms "academic dishonesty" and "dishonest behaviour" we mean students` actions aimed at gaining advantages in the learning process, which violate academic norms and rules regulating the educational process at the university. In this thesis, we consider only one type of student academic dishonesty - cheating, as it is the most common type of academic misconduct among students (Harper et al. 2021).

Literature review

There are many research studies on student dishonest behaviour in different countries. The first large-scale study of student academic dishonesty was conducted by B. Bowers in 1964, in which more than 5400 students from 99 US universities took part (Bowers, 1964). Although there have been earlier studies, this work is considered to be a landmark in the research of student dishonest behavior. Over the years, many studies have used the classification of dishonest practices, as well as the survey instrument developed by B. Bowvers (Harrison et al., 2021). Since then, the topic of student academic misconduct has gained great popularity among researchers around the world, including E. Anderman, D. Bunn, D. McCabe, J. Stephens, L. Trevino, T. Murdock and others. Most researchers attempt to find out: (1) what kind of students are more inclined to dishonest actions (McCabe et al., 2006; Ghanem & Mozahem, 2019); (2) why and how they cheat while studying (Murdock & Anderman, 2006; Brimble, 2016; Yu et al., 2018; Stephens, 2019; Baran & Jonason, 2020); (3) what methods of student dishonesty prevention are developed and applied in universities (McCabe & Pavela, 2004; Hamlin et al., 2013; Milovanovitch,

2020); (4) the consequences of student academic fraud (Nonis & Swift, 2001; LaDuke, 2013).

In Russia, the topic of student academic dishonesty becomes the subject of research less frequently. The Russian researchers who have contributed to the development of this topic are the following: E. V. Denisova-Schmidt, I. S. Chirikov, E. D. Shmeleva, N. G. Maloshonok, S. V. Golunov, G. Z. Efimova, S.M. Herzen, E.O. Leontyeva and others. These researchers investigate the following aspects of student dishonest behaviour: (1) faculty attitudes towards student dishonesty (Radaev & Chirikov, 2006; Chirikov et al., 2020); (2) factors of student academic misconduct (Sivak, 2006; Shmeleva & Semenova, 2019; Maloshonok & Shmeleva, 2019); (3) characteristics of the educational environment in Russian universities that contribute to the prevalence of student dishonest behavior (Golunov, 2010; Shmeleva, 2016); (4) reasons for students` cheating (Efimova & Kicherova, 2012; Kuzminov & Yudkevich, 2021); (5) the effectiveness of measures to prevent student academic dishonesty (Efimova, 2013; Herzen, 2013); (6) the connection between corruption in higher education and academic misconduct (Leontyeva, 2010; Makarova & Vykhrushev, 2014; Denisova-Schmidt, 2016; Denisova-Schmidt et al., 2016; Solovyeva, 2018). Several researchers note that student dishonest behavior is a part of the entire academic system in Russia (Denisova-Schmidt et al., 2016; Mezenin, 2018; Kuzminov & Yudkevich, 2021). Thus, Chirikov and Shmeleva (2018) in their study demonstrate that students become more tolerant towards academic misconduct and start cheating more often during their studies at the university. In their book, Ya. Kuzminov and M. Yudkevich (2021) identify the reasons for the systemic nature of this problem, which include: 1) the mismatch of the student's educational and social capital with the requirements of the university, 2) the predominance of benefits over costs when students commit dishonest acts, 3) the perception of the university environment as dishonest, including dishonest behavior of faculty members, 4) situational and individual characteristics of students. Some researchers link students' tolerant attitudes towards dishonest practices to cultural characteristics and basic mental attitudes of Russian society (Magnus et al., 2002; Lupton & Chaqman, 2002).

It is necessary to understand how students explain dishonest actions and reflect on their acceptance at the university in order to comprehend the low effectiveness of honor

codes. Previous studies applied the following theories to understand the aspects stated above: (1) neutralization theory (Sykes & Matza, 1957); (2) social learning theory (Bandura 2002, 2006); (3) the theory of moral disengagement (Bandura, 2002). These theories help to determine students` attitudes towards academic dishonesty and understand the importance of the educational environment for them. According to the theory of neutralization, students try to shift the blame onto circumstances or other people to justify their fraudulent acts (Sykes & Matza, 1957). For example, they can rationalize their actions by using explanations concerning the lack of time or interest in the subject, incompetence of the faculty members or the eagerness to help their groupmate, etc. (Shmeleva, 2015).

According to Bandura's social cognitive theory (SCT), students justify their behaviour by stating that other students behave the same way, while taking into account the consequences of such behavior in their actions (Bandura 2002, 2006). Another Bandura`s theory of moral disengagement (Bandura, 2002) explains students` dishonest behaviour by their desire to present their actions as morally acceptable (Shu et al., 2011; Pulfrey et al., 2018). For example, they justify their cheating acts by helping their friends / classmates or by their adaptation to different situations, etc.

However, all of these theories have a number of limitations. **The first limitation** is the assumption that students understand that academic dishonesty at the university is wrong and deviant (Stephens, 2019). However, some studies demonstrate the opposite results, showing a great differentiation of views among students (Karanauskienė et al., 2020). Based on the previous research, we assume that students perceive the same actions differently and, depending on their justifications, they may view actions that others consider dishonest as natural and normal. These conclusions are also in line with the fact that student academic dishonesty is a widespread issue in the world.

The second limitation of the discussed theoretical frameworks is the consideration of only one side of the problem, students` justification of dishonest actions. Therefore, only few studies attempt to examine the rationalisations of students' criticism of dishonest practices, which is equally important for understanding the mechanisms for decisionmaking processes about engagement in academic fraud. This may also help to increase the effectiveness of the existing methods for student dishonesty prevention and develop new ones. T. Murdock et al. demonstrated in their study that students` evaluation of the fairness

of the educational situation is a variable that characterizes the relationship between the characteristics of the educational environment and students' attitudes towards academic misconduct (Murdock, Miller, Goetzinger, 2007).

The Originality of the Research

To overcome the limitations mentioned above, we developed a new theoretical and methodological approach based on the theory of sociology of critical capacity by L. Boltanski and L. Thévenot. Based on the analysis of the interviews with Russian and British students, we revealed the productivity of applying Boltanski and Thevenot theory to study university students` views on academic misconduct. As a result, six orders of worth were identified in the interviews, which correspond to the six originally identified orders of worth by L. Boltanski and L. Thévenot in their work: (1) the market order, (2) the industrial order, (3) the civic order, (4) the order of inspiration, (5) the domestic order and (6) the order of fame (Boltanski & Théveno, 2013). All these orders of worth are used to examine the problem of academic dishonesty. For example, according to L. Boltanski and L. Thevenot, the order of inspiration refers to the wellbeing and positive feelings. Applied to the problem of academic dishonesty, this means that students evaluate the educational process from the perspective of personal comfort and positive emotions. The domestic order is based on the traditions and important people with high authority, which means that students` attitude towards academic dishonesty depends on what they have learned from the family and at school. For example, in some cases, parents support students' decision to cheat on an exam or to buy an assignment to get higher grades (AbouZeid 2016; Buckner and Hodges 2016). In the order of fame, the most important principle of the evaluation is opinion of other people. Therefore, students evaluate cases of academic misconduct from the perspective of reputational risks and consequences of such behaviour. The foundation of the civic order is the common good. Thus, students consider dishonest behavior from the perspective of its benefits for the group of students. The market order relies on a sense of competition and people`s desire to gain certain advantages. In this order of worth, students consider the costs and benefits of dishonest behaviour before taking an action. Thus, studies show that the high possibility of being caught and punished reduces the likelihood of student cheating (Freiburger et al. 2017; Kerkvliet and Sigmund 1999). The industrial order of worth is based

on the notion of persons` efficiency. Therefore, students evaluate dishonest actions in terms of the usefulness of the knowledge and skills acquired during their studies for their future career. The research demonstrates that those students who do not plan to take a job related to the obtained degree are more prone to cheating compared to those who plan to work in the field related to the acquired profession (Kuzminov & Yudkevich, 2021). Thus, the use of Boltanski and Thevenot theory allows us to examine not only the justifications of students` dishonest actions but also their criticism, different arguments, ways of thinking and perception of fairness and acceptability of academic dishonesty at the university. This approach also allows us to overcome the limitations of the previously applied theories to the investigation of this problem.

This theoretical framework is used to study the problem of student academic dishonesty for the first time. Therefore, it is also significant to develop an instrument that measures the prevalence of students who draw on different orders of worth to criticise and justify academic misconduct.

Thus, the originality of this research is the development of a new theoretical and methodological approach to study student academic dishonesty. For the first time in this thesis, L. Boltanski and L. Thévenot theory is used to studying student dishonest behaviour, followed by a description of manifestations of each order of criticism and justification in situations where student cheating happens. In addition, a new instrument has been proposed and verified to measure the prevalence of domestic, market and industrial orders of criticism and justification of student dishonest behavior at the university.

Theoretical framework

In this research, to overcome the limitations of the existing theoretical approaches to study student criticism and justification of academic dishonesty, we considered theories that have the following criteria: 1) allow studying not only the justification of deviant behavior, but also its criticism, 2) allow differences in students' judgments about certain actions and events, as well as 3) help to take into account the circumstances in which a person makes a decision regarding the acceptability of deviant behavior. In this case, by deviant behavior, we mean a violation of university rules and regulations for passing exams and assignments, including term papers and essays. Several theoretical concepts fit these criteria, such as the

theory of spheres of justice by M. Walser, the theory of differential association by E. Sutherland, the theory of labeling by J. Mead, the concept of critical ability by L. Boltanski and L. Thevenot.

However, we decided that the neo-pragmatist concept of the sociology of critical capacity by L. Boltanski and L. Thevenot is more suitable for our purposes. Firstly, it is based on the concept of justice, which is better suited to describe students' judgments about the acceptability and justification of academic dishonesty, according to their perception of the fairness of the rules established by the university. We assume that students will justify breaking university rules if they perceive them to be unfair in a certain context and under certain circumstances. Secondly, this concept allows us to identify the grounds on which the students make judgments about criticism or justification of dishonest behavior, which is important for the student in assessing the fairness of academic dishonesty. Thirdly, this theory admits that students use different ways of reasoning and different criteria of justice when evaluating the same actions.

This concept has significantly contributed to the development of contemporary sociological theory (Wagner, 1999; Blokker, 2011). However, it has not been used previously to investigate the problem of academic dishonesty except for this thesis. The proposed theoretical and methodological approach is aimed at studying daily discussions in which various judgments about fairness appear (Kharkhordin, 2007). At the same time, L. Boltanski and L. Thevenot do not follow the point of view associated with individualism and plurality of opinions, but show that different ideas about justice used in everyday disputes are based on certain methods of argumentation.

L. Boltanski and L. Thevenot claim that there are no compelling reasons to consider the external position of a researcher as superior to the position of people engaged in public discussions (Susen, 2014). Consequently, they focus on the analysis of actual arguments used by social actors to justify or criticise different life situations (Wagner, 1999). In application to the analysis of dishonest beahviour, this implies a rejection of the initially negative attitude towards academic dishonesty as "unnatural" and "unjust". Instead, it implies the analysis of opposite positions in social practices – criticism and justification. This means that the same analytical procedures should be applied to the analysis of the arguments for and against academic dishonesty, according to the universal principles

(principles of equivalence) introduced by L. Boltanski and L. Thévenot. This indicates the consideration of not only justifications of dishonest actions (which is common for the theory of neutralization, social learning theory or theory of moral disengagement) (Pulvers, Diekhoff, 1999; Miller, Murdock, Grotewiel, 2017), but also their criticism.

L. Boltanski and L. Thevenot developed not only theoretical foundations of the proposed approach, but also a certain methodology for analysing texts and discussions. They called this methodology "basic grammar", which means a method for texts analysis, consisting of seven elements: (1) principle of equivalence - a way of determining and evaluating the connection between different objects within a dispute; (2) a state of greatness and smallness (worthiness) - the first means what is "just" and "great" within a certain order of criticism and justification, the second means what is "unfair" and "small"; (3) list of subjects/objects and arrangements - the establishment of relevant people and objects, the type of relationship between them for a particular order of worth; (4) the coefficient of greatness – the determining why the "great" are better than the "small" and how they can be useful for the "small"; (5) investment of form - what the "great" have to do to be "great"; (6) paradigmatic test - a way of determining the greatness / smallness of subjects and objects within a certain order of criticism and justification; (7) a harmonious figure of natural order - the perfect situation where "great" and "small" coexist fairly.

Based on the systematic analysis of managerial literature, L. Boltanski and L. Thévenot initially identified six orders of worth: (1) the market order, (2) the industrial order, (3) the civic order, (4) the order of inspiration, (5) the domestic order and (6) the order of fame (Болтански, Тевено, 2013). Later on they identified the seventh order of worth – (7) project - oriented (Naumova, 2014). Following Boltanski and Thevenot "basic grammar", we analysed student interviews and identified six orders of criticism and justification of dishonest behaviour that were originally discovered by L. Boltanski and L. Thevenot. The orders of worth also depend on the context. Thus, there may be distinguished entirely new orders of criticism and justification depending on the topic. In addition, orders of worth may transform and change over time. Thus, following the approach proposed by L. Boltanski and L. Thevenot, we examine students` opinions about academic misconduct, based on their evaluation of the fairness of such actions that may help to overcome the limitations of the presented theoretical approaches above.

Aim and objectives of the study

The aim of this research is to develop a theoretical and methodological approach to study students' attitudes towards dishonest behavior, based on their evaluation of the fairness of different academic situations at the university.

The objectives of the study:

1. To analyse the developed honor codes by Russian universities and evaluate how their principles are reflected in students' arguments about academic dishonesty.
2. To examine the potential of the theories applied to explain the differences in students` criticism and justification of dishonest behavior.
3. To analyse the applicability of the theoretical and methodological approach of L. Boltanski and L. Thévenot to study students' attitudes towards dishonest behavior, their criticism and justification of dishonest practices, and to examine the possibilities of the new approach to contribute to the development of an effective policy aimed at preventing student academic dishonesty at a university.
4. To develop and test an instrument that allows evaluating the prevalence of students` judgments about academic dishonesty.

Research questions and publications

1. What discourses and values are present in honor codes and other university policies aimed at preventing student dishonest behavior? To what extent are university policies on academic dishonesty consistent with students' perceptions of the acceptability and fairness of dishonest behavior at the university?

Publication: Dremova O.V. (2020). Russian University Policies on Students` Academic Dishonesty: Punishment or Ethical Training. *University Management: Practice and Analysis*. 24(4):30-45.

2. How do the existing theoretical approaches explain students` attitudes towards dishonest behavior at the university? What are the limitations of these approaches?

Publication: Dremova O.V. (2020). Student academic dishonesty: Review of theoretical frameworks and methods of prevention. *Pedagogy and Psychology of Education.* 2:93-111.

3. What are the possibilities of applying the theory of L. Boltanski and L. Thévenot to study students` criticism and justification of dishonest behavior at the university? What advantages and disadvantages does this approach have compared to the existing theoretical approaches applied to the problem of students` dishonesty?

Publication: Dremova O. V., Maloshonok N. G., Terentiev E. A. (2020). Seeking Justice in Academia: Criticism and Justification of Student Academic Dishonesty. *Monitoring of Public Opinion: Economic and Social Changes*. 4: 366-394.

4. What orders of criticism and justification of dishonest behavior can be distinguished using the Boltansky-Thevenot approach?

Publication: Dremova O. V., Maloshonok N. G., Terentiev E. A. (2020). Seeking Justice in Academia: Criticism and Justification of Student Academic Dishonesty. *Monitoring of Public Opinion: Economic and Social Changes*. 4: 366-394.

5. Is it possible to estimate the prevalence of orders of worth that are used for the criticism and justification of academic dishonesty, and how?

Publication: Dremova O., Maloshonok N., Terentev E. and Federiakin D. (2021). Criticism and justification of undergraduate academic dishonesty: development and validation of the domestic, market and industrial orders of worth scales. *European Journal of Higher Education.* 1-18.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY AND DESIGN
Empirical data

This study utilizes a mixed-methods research design, which analyses the environment and context in which students' judgments about dishonest behavior are formed. In this thesis, we integrate the research methods according to the principle of "successive contributions", which is considered the most effective. Firstly, it implies the conducting of qualitative research (in our case, interviews with students), and then quantitative to verify the data obtained at the qualitative stage (Morgan, 2015).

To achieve the first objective, we carried out discourse analysis using N. Ferclo's approach. We analysed the linguistic and rhetorical features of ethical policies of Russian universities and distinguished discourses regarding student dishonest behaviour in these policies and public statements of the universities` management. The research sample

consists of honor codes and other ethical policies, presented on the websites of Russian universities and public statements made by universities` management, published in media.

The selection of policies was carried out as follows. The sample involved 21 Russian universities participating in Project 5-100. That project was a government initiative aimed at increasing the competitiveness of leading Russian universities in the global education market. The choice of universities from that project was based on the fact that those universities are considered leading in Russia, they respond to modern changes quicker than other universities and strive to achieve the highest results in the quality of higher education, which determines their particular concern about academic integrity. Then universities were selected based on the availability of honor codes and other ethical policies on their websites. However, the findings cannot be generalized to all Russian universities due to the sample. In total, 12 public statements of universities` management representatives, 10 honor codes, 12 policies on plagiarism and 21 policies concerning internal regulations for students were considered.

Publication: Publication: Dremova O.V. (2020). Russian University Policies on Students` Academic Dishonesty: Punishment or Ethical Training. University Management: Practice and Analysis. 24(4):30-45.

Generally, theories of fraudulent behavior appear from the application of a more general theory of human behavior to explain student academic dishonesty at the university. Therefore, to achieve the second objective, we analysed and classified existing theoretical approaches to conceptualize the dishonest behaviour of students, depending on the research subject of these theories. With the help of a system-structural approach that helps to study the structures of theoretical concepts and their elements (Abakumova et al., 2017). There were identified the following groups of theoretical frameworks that were used to study student dishonest behavior: motivational theories; behavioristic theories; theories of deviant behavior; theories, considering a student as a rational actor. This classification suggests the causes and socio-psychological mechanisms of academic misconduct.

Publication: Dremova O.V. (2020). Student academic dishonesty: Review of theoretical frameworks and methods of prevention. *Pedagogy and Psychology of Education,* 2, 93-111.

Twenty-three semi-structured interviews with undergraduate domestic students at three Russian universities and undergraduate domestic students at three British universities were conducted in 2019 to check the applicability of L. Boltanski and L. Thevenot theory (see Appendix). The sample of respondents consisted of students who graduated from high school in Russian and the UK respectively. The choice of universities in these two countries was determined by the results of several studies, which show that students` attitudes towards academic dishonesty may differ in various countries (YukhymenkoLescroart, 2014; Preiss et al., 2013). For example, in Russia and the UK there are completely different situations regarding the dishonest behavior of students. Comparative studies show that Russian students are more likely to commit dishonest acts and are more tolerant of academic fraud at the university than their counterparts in the US and European countries (Lupton and Chaqman, 2002; Magnus et al., 2002; Grimes, 2004). However, these differences do not mean that theoretical approaches applied to explain student dishonest behavior in one national context will not work in another (Ives, Giukin 2020; Maloshonok, Shmeleva 2019). Therefore, we assume that L. Boltanski and L. Thévenot theoretical concept may be the foundation for a new theoretical and methodological approach applicable to different national contexts.

The Russian sample consists of two highly selective Moscow universities, one of which is a participant of Project 5-100 (1,2) and one medium-selective regional university (3). The sample of UK universities also consists of two highly selective universities that are part of the "Russell group", which consists of the leading universities in the United Kingdom (4,5) and one medium-selective regional university (6). The criterion for the selectivity of Russian universities was the number of unifies state exams scores required for admission to the state-funded places. Thus, the universities that accept applicants for state-funded places with an average score of 70 and above are highly selective, the universities that accept students with an average score of 70 to 56 are considered moderately selective, those that accept students with scores below 56 are considered low selective. (Monitoring of the quality of university admissions, 2019). The criterion for the selectivity of British universities is the results obtained at the A-level exams - an analogue of the Russian unified state exam (Reshetar & Pitts, 2020). Among the entire sample, only one Russian university specializes in finance and economics (2), the rest of the universities are

multidisciplinary. All universities in the sample are large with more than 20 thousand students.

The interview guide was based on a literature review and included the following blocks: 1) general information about student experience at university, 2) attitudes towards academic dishonesty, 3) dishonest behavior at university, and 4) cases of dishonest actions committed by the respondent. Interview questions referred to the following dishonest actions at the university and the respondent's attitude towards them: cheating at exams, cheating in assignments, plagiarism / self-plagiarism, falsification of references, contract cheating. Questions about these dishonest practices were asked in the form of hypothetical situations, for example, "Imagine that you saw your classmate cheating at the exam. How would you characterize such situation? Are these actions acceptable at the university? Why? May such actions affect your relationship with your classmate(s)? Why?". These questions were refined for the interviews with British students to fit the UK educational context.

The interview analysis was based on thematic coding according to the principles of L. Boltansky and L. Thevenot theory. The three experts independently coded the individual narratives found in the interviews with students. After that, the selected semantic codes were discussed and confirmed by the experts. In addition, the orders of criticism and justification were determined using the method of basic grammar developed by L. Boltansky and L. Thevenot, adapted to study student dishonest behavior.

Publication: Dremova O. V., Maloshonok N. G., Terentiev E. A. (2020). Seeking Justice in Academia: Criticism and Justification of Student Academic Dishonesty. *Monitoring of Public Opinion: Economic and Social Changes*. 4: 366-394.

We compiled a list of narratives from the interviews with students related to the three of the six orders of criticism and justification to achieve **the fourth objective**: domestic, market and industrial, since we were limited by the possibility to add only ten statements to the survey of student experience at university. These orders of worth were chosen for two reasons. Firstly, we found these orders of worth in student interviews more often. Secondly, the university can influence them more than the other three orders of worth. In addition, while developing an instrument, we had to limit the statements only to cheating practices, since it is impossible to foresee and ask about all types of dishonesty. Moreover, cheating is the most common type of dishonesty among students (Harper et al. 2021).

These statements were tested in a pilot study conducted in April 2020 with participation of 14 students. This pilot study aimed to ensure that the questionnaire items accurately addressed the research questions and that they were well defined and clearly understood. As a result, the list of items was slightly corrected. Then the developed instrument was included in the study "Monitoring of student experience", which was conducted in the universities participating in the consortium "Evidence-Based Digitalization for Student Success". The data was collected as part of an online survey launched in April-May 2020 at eight universities in Russia (YSTU, YSU, NSTU, TPU, OmSTU, UlSPU, SFU, SFeDU). The instrument statements were distributed among students who studied only in 6 out of 8 universities. Ten items about academic dishonesty developed in this study were randomly assigned to 60% of the respondents. The total sample for this study is 3,538 students from 6 universities, and 61% of respondents are female. The sampled students specialized in engineering and technologies (54%), social sciences (27%), and mathematics and natural sciences (19%). The response rate ranged from 2% to 54% in different universities, with a mean of 16%. The final questionnaire included the following ten items measured on a four-point Likert scale ("Completely disagree", "Somewhat disagree", "Somewhat agree", "Completely agree"):

Domestic world

- I am ashamed to use cheat sheets in an exam
- I know from school that there is nothing wrong with cheating
- I try not to use cheat sheets in exams because I have been raised like that.

Market world
- If a course is boring, then you can use cheat sheets in the exam.
- If a course is useless for my future career, then I can use cheat sheets
- If a student is afraid to forget the material, then that student can use cheat sheets on an exam.
- If there is not enough time to prepare for the exam, then I can cheat

Industrial world
- If I plan to have a job related to my degree, then using cheat sheets is unacceptable

- If I want to gain knowledge and skills necessary for my future career, then I don't cheat
- Cheating leads to the graduation of unskilled professionals

At the first stage, we analysed the data using an exploratory factor analysis to confirm the validity of the proposed three-factor instrument model. During the analysis there were identifies three factors, corresponding to the domestic, market and industrial orders. This result confirmed the theoretically expected factor structure of the instrument. At the next stage, we used a confirmatory factor analysis to confirm the internal structure and effectiveness of the proposed instrument (Little, 2014). At this stage, the statements and their relation to the theoretically incorporated factors was checked and their transformation into meaningfully interpreted scales was carried out.

Publication: Dremova O., Maloshonok N., Terentev E. and Federiakin D. Criticism and justification of undergraduate academic dishonesty: development and validation of the domestic, market and industrial orders of worth scales // European Journal of Higher Education. 2021. 1-18.

Limitations

This study has several limitations that are important to consider before studying the received results:

1. The study used self-report data and students` interviews, which impose some limitations due to the sensitivity of the topic since students could give socially desirable answers, which may not reflect the real behavior of the respondents. Moreover, the data obtained do not allow to take into account the difference in the methods of justification used by students in relation to themselves and others. The distinguished orders of criticism and justification should be considered as discursive practices of public discussion of academic dishonesty, and not as stable mechanisms used by students to make decisions about cheating at a university.

2. Interviews were conducted only with students studying at educational programs in economics and management. Possibly, there might be identified different orders of worth in the interviews with students from other educational programs.

3.   Most of the respondents represented highly selective universities, whose actions and perceptions may differ from those that are common for students studying in less selective universities. This also applies to the sample of universities used for the analysis of ethical policies, which included only highly selective universities participating in the Project 5-100. Consequently, we can assume the existence of alternative discursive practices about academic dishonesty among students and different ethical policies in those universities that were not included in the sample. Due to these peculiar properties of the sample, this study is not representative and the obtained findings cannot be generalized to all Russian universities.

4.   The developed survey instrument includes questions only about students` cheating, which is the most obvious and widespread form of academic dishonesty. However, we do not take into account other types of dishonest student behavior such as plagiarism, forgery, etc. In addition, this instrument estimates only the prevalence of the three out of the six orders of worth. Therefore, this instrument requires further modifications to estimate the prevalence of the other three orders of worth.

MAIN RESULTS

Policies of Russian universities in relation to student academic dishonesty

There were identified the following key topics of university ethical policies based on the results of discourse analysis: responsibility for academic dishonesty, sanctions, and academic integrity. These topics were identified according to the following criteria: high frequency of use in the texts and public statements; their use as the main themes of the ethical policies of universities; reference to them in the public statements of the university management.

Table 1. The main themes and discourses of university ethical policies and public statements of university management about student dishonest behavior

Theme	Punitive discourse	Value discourse

Responsibility for student academic dishonesty	Students are entirely responsible for their actions	Teachers are responsible for students` dishonest practices while university administration evades its responsibility for student academic dishonesty
Sanctions for student academic dishonesty	Various types of punishments (reprimand, resubmission of the assignment, expulsion etc.)	Informing students about the importance of academic integrity and university support in its implementation
The importance of student academic integrity	The rationale is students` attitudes towards dishonest behavior which are based on students' ideas about its costs and benefits	The rationale is university corporate culture and norms and traditions established in a society

In general, the official ethical policies of Russian universities do not pay enough attention to the regulation of situations in which cases of student dishonesty occur. According to these policies, students are entirely responsible for their dishonest actions, and faculty members are responsible for the formation of students' attitudes towards academic integrity and control over their dishonest behavior. Thus, university management shifts its responsibility for student dishonesty on faculty members and students and takes the position of an observer and assistant in resolving possible conflicts. At the same time, in cases when university management is required to take an action in relation to the dishonest students` acts, various types of sanctions are applied according to the ethical policies. We named such a position as punitive. However, according to the existing research, different sanctions and the use of traditional punitive discourse in university ethical policies are not sufficient to address student academic dishonesty (SutherlandSmith, 2011; Macdonald & Carroll, 2006).

The results of our analysis show that there are several possible reasons for this, which, along with other features of ethical policies, may lead to their low efficiency: 1) specific language of policies that is not always clear to students; 2) references in ethical policies to laws and regulations; 3) full responsibility for dishonest behavior on students and faculty members; 4) insufficiency of ethical policies in general, and in relation to the values and norms adopted at the university. Thus, at the moment, ethical regulations in Russian universities are considered to be a punitive mechanism of the administrative system, and this may be the reason why honor codes are not effective enough. However, discussions of honor code projects have been resumed recently in Russian universities and the implemented codes of ethics and regulations regarding student academic integrity undergo some changes. More elements of value discourse start to appear in ethical policies. For example, there are references to moral values and norms: "*This honor code has been developed according to the moral and cultural values, customs and traditions that are in force in the university campus*" (KFU, Code of Ethics). Thus, the value discourse is beginning to gain popularity among Russian universities. It is also worth noting that the presence of ethical documents in universities is not an indicator of their application. This suggests that the system of ethical regulation in Russian universities is still in formation and requires special attention.

Review and classification of theories applied to study student dishonest behavior

We determined how the position of the university management regarding student academic dishonesty is presented in their ethical policies. To understand students' attitudes towards academic fraud, we analyze theories aimed at explaining students' dishonest behavior. Such theories have usually emerged from the application of more general theories of human behavior to the conceptualization of student dishonesty at the university. According to the subject matter of these theories, they were combined into the following groups: motivational (self-efficacy theory, self-determination theory and achievement goal theory); behavioral (the theory of planned behavior by I. Aizen and the theory of operant conditioning); theories of deviant behavior (the general theory of crime and neutralization theory); theories that consider a student as a rational actor (expectancy-value theory and rational choice theory).

A group of motivational theories (self-efficacy theory, self-determination theory and achievement goal theory) studies factors that influence the achievement of a person's own goals. Following these theories, factors associated with the involvement of students in dishonest practices were identified: students' perception of their academic capabilities, external motivation of doing assignments (Kanat-Maymon et al., 2015), aspiration to demonstrate high competencies (Anderman & Freeman, 2007). However, some researchers criticized the identified factors and the application of these theories to study student academic dishonesty. For example, K. Eastman and J. Marzillier consider selfefficacy theory to be ambiguous and poorly formulated (Eastman & Marzillier, 1984). In more recent studies, this theory is also criticized for the way self-efficacy is operationalized. According to the researchers, the perception of self-efficacy is just a reflection not a defining factor of certain actions. Therefore, the possibilities of using this theory to understand people's behavior are limited (Cahill et al., 2006; Williams, 2010). T. Murdock et al. (2001) consider the factors identified with the help of self-determination theory and related to the internal/external motivation of students to be insignificant. In addition, this theory does not take into account the role of the educational environment in the formation of student motivation. The results of the study by N. Maloshonok et al. (2015) show that two types of motivation can coexist among students (for mastery and for demonstration). Moreover, the type of motivation may vary depending on the university course. Thus, it cannot always predict student's inclination to dishonesty.

The group of behavioral theories (the theory of planned behavior by I. Aizen and the theory of operant conditioning) considers behavioral concepts that are also associated with the educational process. According to these theories, researchers identify the following factors associated with students' dishonest practices: the student's own attitude towards dishonest behavior, subjective norms adopted at the university, perceived behavioral control, success in committing academic fraud (Armitage & Conner, 2001; Maloshonok, 2016). However, the same researchers highlight the limitations of these theories, for example, the theory of planned behavior does not take into account such variables as self-identification, self-efficacy and past behavior of the student, and the theory of operant conditioning does not consider the reasons of student dishonest actions. Therefore, it should

be used together with other theoretical concepts. (Armitage & Conner, 2001; Little Boy, 2016).

The group of deviation theories (the general theory of crime and neutralization theory) considers deviant behavior and the following sanctions. According to these theories, low levels of self-control, an opportunity to commit dishonest actions, positive attitudes towards academic fraud, and perceptions of the educational environment are the factors that facilitate the prevalence and frequency of student dishonesty (Bolin, 2004; Pulvers & Diekhoff, 1999). However, A. Bolin (2004) in his work emphasizes that the level of self-control and academic dishonesty are not related to each other, if the factor of student's positive attitudes towards academic dishonesty is not taken into account. In this case, the general theory of crime will be inadequate. In addition, critics of the neutralization theory say that this theory only considers how students justify their behavior and does not take into account their criticism of dishonest actions (Karanauskienė et al., 2020).

The group of theories that considers a student as a rational actor (expectancy-value theory and rational choice theory) examines people`s behavior in terms of possible costs and benefits for them. In application to the problem of student dishonest behavior, these theories focus on students' cognitive perception of learning situations. According to these theories, four factors can be identified that encourage students to commit dishonest acts: 1) expectation of a positive outcome from cheating on an assignment, such as getting a higher grade, 2) academic value of an assignment, 3) low costs, such as low possibility of being caught and punished, and 4) students' perception of an academic situation in general (Yang et al., 2013). The researchers that criticise expectancy-value theory argue that student dishonest behaviour depends not only on their desire to benefit with little costs, but also on the educational environment that can foster such desires (Yang et al., 2013). However, the researchers that criticise rational choice theory state that students' dishonest behavior cannot be interpreted solely by their selfish desires (Bourdieu, 2005).

The analysis of the theories applied to study students` attitudes towards academic dishonesty indicates a wide range of factors associated with students` engagement in dishonest practices, as well as their limitations. The first limitation refers to evaluation of student dishonest behavior as something negative that requires elimination. The second limitation is the lack of studies examining students' criticism of academic dishonesty.

Application of L. Boltansky and L. Thevenot concept to study students` criticism and justification of dishonest behavior at the university

One of our objectives is to find a theory that overcomes the above limitations. We have chosen the theoretical concept of L. Boltansky and L. Thevenot, which allows: 1) to consider dishonest behaviour from a different angle as something natural; 2) to consider the real discussions around academic dishonesty by students 3) to analyse criticism and justification of dishonest practices by students. The applicability of this theory to exploring student academic dishonesty was verified by the analysis of 23 semi-structured interviews with undergraduate students in management and economics.

The analysis of the interviews showed the productivity of using L. Boltansky and L. Thevenot approach to study student dishonest behaviour. The application of the "basic grammar" model made it possible to distinguish six orders of criticism and justification of dishonest behavior in students' statements, which correspond to the six out of the seven orders of criticism and justification presented in L. Boltansky and L. Thevenot`s work (Boltansky, Thevenot, 2013): the order of inspiration, the domestic order, the order of fame, the civic order, the market order and the industrial order, which allowed us to consider students` perceptions of academic dishonesty and take into account the arguments they use to criticise and justify dishonest behaviour. The description of these orders of worth using the basic grammar is presented in Table 2.

Table 2. The orders of worth at the university

Orders of worth	Basic grammar						
	Principle of equivalence	**State of worthiness**	**List of subjects/objects and arrangements**	**The coefficient of greatness**	**Investment of form**	**Paradigmatic test**	**Harmonious figure of natural order**

The order of inspiration	Achieving a state of grace that does not depend on other people`s opinion, it arises from the senses	Great ones are faculty members who can make their course interesting and create trusting relationships with students, as well as students who are interested in learning and who feel comfortable in classes and exams. Small ones are faculty members who cannot or do not	Lecturers, course, topic, assignments, interactive tools, comfortable environment Natural relationships: inspire selfconfidence, interest, enthusiasm, enjoy the educational process	The proffesor, the course, the topic are significant and great if they are able to arouse interestn in students (small ones), evoke positive emotions in them, and also create a calm and relaxing atmosphere at the exam / test	Emotions	Students' opinions about the lecturer and the educational process	The educational process contributes to obtaining positive emotions (interest, inspiration, joy) and does not cause negative emotions (fear, boredom, rejection)

		know how to make their course interesting, and students who are not interested in learning and feel negative emotions towards it.					
The domestic order	The people`s value depends on a hierarchy of trust, respect for tradition,	Great ones - parents, teachers at school, professors, friends at university Small ones- students who want to establish trusting relationships with others	Titles, degree of kinship, trust, value orientations Natural relationships: students help others in exchange for being treated well by others, as well as subordination	The great ones influence the behavior of the small. Teachers at school, faculty members at the university and parents are great because they form a role model for students (small ones) and their value orientations. Friends are great because they provide an opportunity to maintain good	Beliefs, values, moral ideas about the right and acceptable things and about friendship	Sociometric method	The educational process contributes to the formation of a trusting relationship between professors and students, as well as between classmates, and corresponds to the traditions and values that students follow

				relations in exchange for some benefits			by the influence of school and family
The order of fame	The opinion of other people, the number of individuals recognizing a person	Great ones - students with a good reputation among faculty members and classmates Great and weighty, famous, recognized and convincing	Evaluation, praise, diploma, rating, reputation	The great ones make a good impression on the small ones.	Demonstration of desired behavior and results by any means	Evaluation of the student by classmates, faculty members, parents. Formal recognition: awards, diplomas	The educational process assumes that investment in learning leads to the creation of a positive image of the student in the eyes of others. The diploma reflects people's opinions about the graduate

The civic order	Striving for the common good, following norms and rules	Great ones- are students who help others, set the "correct" behavior patterns Small ones are students who accept this help	Help, honor code, students, community, classmates	Students are great if they do something for the benefit of the other students (small ones)	Good deeds lead to the common good	Group approval	The educational process leads to the common good, is beneficial for all
The market order	Aspiration to profit	Great ones are those faculty members and students who get benefits with a minimum of effort and know how to take advantage of an opportunity	Diploma, assessment, contract cheating, plagiarism, cheating	The great ones use the opportunities that the small ones give them. For example, a student who wants to cheat takes an advantage of different situations at the exam. The professor does not check assignments properly in order to save time while students do not express dissatisfaction, etc.	Tricks, money, social connections, reputation	Tricks, money, social connections, reputation	The educational process is designed in such a way that allows students and faculty members to achieve personal goals and receive benefits.

The industrial order	efficiency	Greatness is based on the efficiency in the future workplace and defines a hierarchy of professional abilities	Knowledge, skills, employer requirements, practice	The great ones gain knowledge and skills to be effective in the future workplace and get a job that is related the degree obtained, leaving the small ones an opportunity to find a job that's is no related to their degree	Time, efforts	Employment	The educational process is arranged in such a way that courses allow a student to obtain the necessary knowledge and skills for future professional activities

Within each of the selected orders of worth, students use certain logics of criticism and justification of dishonest behavior (see Table 3). According to the order of inspiration, students base their judgments about academic dishonesty based on their emotional state. For example, if they are not interested in the course, the learning material, or they experience stress/fear in the classroom, then in such cases, they justify academic dishonesty. However, if a student enjoys the learning process, for example, they like doing assignments, they understand the topic, or they are interested in the course, then in such cases, they criticise academic dishonesty.

According to the domestic order, students evaluate of academic dishonesty based on the beliefs adopted from their family, school and people they trust. For example, some students justify cheating and plagiarism by the fact that it is not considered wrong by their family or school. The other students criticise academic cheating because they were taught to be honest by their family/school.

According to the order of fame, students are guided by the opinions of other people. Therefore, in cases where their reputation is at stake, academic dishonesty is considered unjustified. However, if cheating can make their grades and reputation among classmates and professors better, as well as earn praise from parents. In these cases, dishonest behavior is justified.

The students that follow the civic order of worth evaluate dishonest behavior in terms of overall benefit. According to this order, students value mutual assistance, even if it violates academic rules and regulations. For example, helping to pass an exam or giving someone homework to copy is considered justified, as it benefits the whole group and is consistent with its rules. However, if such actions lead to negative consequences for the whole group of students, students criticize academic dishonesty

According to the market order, the main aspiration for students is to achieve the maximum benefit by investing the minimum effort and time. Dishonest behavior is considered fair if it contributes to a quick and easy goal achievement, such as cheating in a test to get a higher grade. Cheating behavior is criticized if there is a possibility of not achieving the desired results and being punished.

The industrial order of criticism and justification of dishonest behaviour is based on one`s efficiency and the usefulness of the knowledge and skills acquired at the university

for the future professional activity. Accordingly, dishonest actions are considered fair if courses at the university are considered useless for a future career, for example, students have a negative attitude towards a large amount of theoretical material taught at a university. On the other hand, students criticise dishonest practices, as they contribute to the graduation of an unqualified professional.

Table 3. Students` criticism and justification of dishonest behavior by the order of worth

	Criticism	Justifications
The order of inspiration	Dishonest behavior is wrong because it prevents a person from enjoying studying process and leads to negative emotions	Dishonest behavior is acceptable because it helps to get a better grade in a boring course, to cope with negative emotions (stress) at the exam
The domestic order	Dishonest behavior is wrong because it is against traditions and values taught in family and school	Dishonest behavior is acceptable because it is accepted by family and school
The order of fame	Dishonest behavior is wrong, because it may ruin student`s reputation	Dishonest behavior is acceptable because it allows a student to get parents, teachers, and other students` praise for good grades.
The civic order	Dishonest behavior is wrong because it harms a person, group, society	Dishonest behavior is acceptable in case of helping a friend or a groupmate
The market order	Dishonest behavior is wrong because it is risky and can lead to negative consequences	Dishonest behavior is acceptable because it allows a student to achieve the goal (get a good grade) with less effort and time

The industrial order	Dishonest behavior is wrong because it prevents a student to gain knowledge and skills required for a future job	Dishonest behavior is acceptable, because the university does not provide knowledge and skills that are useful for future profession

Thus, the application of L. Boltansky and L. Thevenot concept allows: (1) to see different points of view on student academic dishonesty; (2) to formulate hypotheses why the holistic approach aimed at preventing student academic dishonesty may be ineffective and (3) to develop new measures for academic dishonesty prevention.

The development and approbation of an instrument for measuring the prevalence of domestic, market and industrial orders of worth among students

The results of the study demonstrate the benefits of the application of L. Boltanski and L. Thevenot theory (Boltanski and Thevenot, 1999) to explore student dishonest behaviour at university. Based on this theory and interview analysis, there was developed an instrument aimed at measuring the prevalence of students' referring to domestic, market and industrial orders of worth. These orders of worth were chosen for two reasons. First, they are the more frequent codes in undergraduate interviews. Second, they can be more easily influenced by universities than the other three orders of worth. We included only 10 items referring to exam cheating in the instrument to make questions clearer and more specific, as recent research showed that students report cheating more often during examinations (Harper, Bretag, and Rundle 2021)..

The results show a good fit of ten items to the three-factor structure (see Table 1). The item-factor loadings are all significantly different from zero at the $p < 0.001$ level and interpretable (Table 2). Cronbach's alpha of each scale ranged from 0.67 to 0.77, and McDonalds Omega ranged from 0.73 to 0.83, which suggests that each scale can be considered a reliable measure. At this stage, we have shown that the factor structure of the developed indicators corresponds to the theoretical provisions of the proposed conceptual model. The analysis of the psychometric properties of the tool indicates the possibility of using it to determine the three modes of criticism and justification followed by students in

quantitative research. However, further validation of the instrument needs to be carried out, in particular, to assess its construct validity.

Table 4. The estimates of the model fit.

Statistics	Values
The baseline model	
Degrees of freedom for Chi-Squared statistic	45
Chi-Squared statistic	43173.610
Sample size	3538
The estimated model	
Number of free parameters	43
Degrees of freedom for statistics	32
Chi-Squared statistic	539.282
RMSEA	0.067
90% confidence interval for RMSEA	[0.062; 0.072]
SRMR	0.041
CFI	0.988
TLI	0.983

Table 5. The estimates of the measurement model.

Item	Standardized factor loading	Standard Error
Domestic world (Cronbach's alpha = 0.687, McDonald's SEM Omega = 0.748)		
I am ashamed to use cheat sheets in an exam	0.735	0.010
I know from school that there is nothing wrong with cheating	-0.657	0.013
I try not to use cheat sheets in exams because I have been raised like that	0.723	0.011
Market world (Cronbach's alpha = 0.769, McDonald's SEM Omega = 0.825)		
If a course is boring, then you can use cheat sheets in the exam	0.731	0.010
If a course is useless for my future career, then I can use cheat sheets	0.715	0.010
If a student is afraid to forget the material, then that student can use cheat sheets on an exam	0.731	0.010

If there is not enough time to prepare for the exam, then I can cheat	0.753	0.010
Industrial world (Cronbach's alpha = 0.673, McDonald's SEM Omega = 0.731)		
If I plan to have a job related to my degree, then using cheat sheets is unacceptable	0.690	0.012
If I want to gain knowledge and skills necessary for my future career, then I don't cheat	0.771	0.012
Cheating leads to the graduation of unskilled professionals	0.602	0.013

The inter-scale correlations between the three factors are significant at the $p < 0.001$ level and range from 0.64 to 0.80 ($p < 0.001$) in absolute values. (see Table 6).

Table 6. Factor correlations.

	Domestic world	**Market world**
Market world	-0.778	
Industrial world	0.799	-0.640

The correlation between market and domestic orders of worth is negative, which can be explained by the differences in the principle of equivalence underlying these orders of worth. In the domestic world, people's actions are guided by tradition and position in the

hierarchy of trust, while in the market world, people compete. The correlation between the industrial and domestic world is positive, while a correlation with the market order of worth is negative. This is a substantial result that does not contradict the theoretical assumptions of Boltanski and Thevenot. This may be explained by the Soviet background of Russia. Parents of the current students grew up in the system of planned economy (Carr and Davies 1969) and in a society where collectivist values were dominant (Velichkovsky et al. 2019). The government regulated social and economic processes, all organizations and factories were public, and there was no market competition. There was an enormous influence of the government on families and schools where the "right citizens" were formed. This national characteristic can be the reason for a strong positive correlation between domestic and industrial orders of worth and a strong negative association between the market and industrial worlds observed in this study.

The developed instrument can be used in further quantitative research and for the monitoring of students' criticism and justification of academic misconduct. As the structure and content of the university policies on academic misconduct and honour codes appear to be closely connected with students` decision-making processes on cheating, it is important to construct policies carefully with specific details about what constitutes academic dishonesty, the importance of academic integrity, procedures for cheating prevention, and sanctions for such actions. All these details should be in line with the students' prevalent orders of worth.

Statements to defend

1.   The management of Russian universities follows a punitive discourse, which is reflected in the universities` ethical policies. The punitive discourse refers to the statements of ethical policies regarding the application of various sanctions in case of student academic dishonesty. At the same time, universities` management pays more attention to the value discourse in university strategies and regulations. This discourse is aimed to form positive attitudes towards academic integrity among students.

2.   Existing theoretical approaches that are applied to explore the ways students justify dishonest beahviour, such as (1) social learning theory, (2) neutralization

theory, and (3) moral disengagement theory, have a limited view of dishonest practices at the university. Firstly, they consider dishonest behaviour from an as a negative phenomenon and consider such opinion to be common to students, although this is not always the case. Secondly, they overlook the criticism of dishonest behavior presented in students' narratives. Therefore, they cannot explain decision-making mechanisms for engaging in dishonest practices.

3.   The application of L. Boltansky and L. Thevenot theory to the analysis of students' attitudes towards dishonest behavior allows us to overcome the limitations of the previously applied theoretical approaches for the following reasons. Firstly, it allows us to identify the variability of the orders of criticism and justification referred to academic dishonesty in students` discussions, which correlate with the six orders of criticism and justification proposed by L. Boltansky and L. Thevenot: the order of inspiration, the domestic order, the order of fame, the civic order, the market order and the industrial order. Secondly, this theory allows us to understand why the holistic measures aimed to prevent students` dishonesty are currently insufficient. In addition, the use of this theory is empirically justified.

4.   The developed instrument for the evaluation of the prevalence of criticism and justification orders of worth demonstrated acceptable indicators of reliability and can be used in monitoring studies of first-year students upon entering the university to study their attitudes towards academic dishonesty, as well as to evaluate the effectiveness of existing measures to combat dishonest behaviour and to develop new ones.

Scientific implications

In this study, we propose a new theoretical and methodological approach that shows the importance of exploring the two sides of the discussion - criticism and justification, which most contemporary studies on student dishonest behavior are lacking. This new approach allows to take a fresh look at students' attitudes towards academic dishonesty.

The proposed theoretical framework to study student dishonest behaviour, developed by L. Boltansky and L. Thevenot, eliminates the negative evaluative component inherent in the concept of academic dishonesty and identifies the arguments used by students for or against academic dishonesty. Thus, there were identified six methods of

criticism and justification that correspond to the six orders of worth identified by L. Boltansky and L. Thevenot in their work (Boltansky, Thevenot, 2013). Students in their judgments regarding situations of dishonest behavior used these orders of worth: civic, domestic, market, industrial, inspiration and fame.

This research contributes to the development of the theoretical and methodological foundations for studying student dishonest behavior. There was proposed a theoretical framework and, on its basis, a survey instrument is developed and validated. This instrument can be used to study students' attitudes towards academic dishonesty and to measure the prevalence of domestic, market, or industrial orders of criticism and justification.

Further research on student attitudes towards academic dishonesty may include: 1) the development of an instrument to measure the prevalence of three other orders of criticism and justification: the order of inspiration, civic order, and the order of fame; 2) the discussion of factors associated with resorting to a particular order of worth, such as gender, age, academic results, as well as 3) testing the (in)effectiveness of the measures proposed in this paper to combat academic dishonesty and 4) conducting additional research to validate the proposed instrument. In addition, there should be conducted a similar study in other national contexts, since it is possible that the prevalence and the type of criticism and justification orders of worth among students may differ depending on the cultural characteristics of the environment.

Practical implications

Since the structure and content of university ethical policies regarding academic misconduct do not seem to be connected to the student decision-making mechanisms about dishonest behavior. Therefore, it is important to carefully develop ethical policies that mention what constitutes academic dishonesty, the importance of academic integrity, procedures for preventing student dishonesty and sanctions imposed for dishonest actions according to the order of criticism and justification that are prevalent among students. Moreover, as previous studies demonstrate, it is extremely important to involve students in the process of creating honor codes and monitoring the implementation of the rules established in them. Such an approach can contribute to the establishment of a sustainable interaction between the university and its students (Dix et al. 2014; Raman & Ramlogan

2020). In this way, both parties will be able to benefit: the university will maintain and improve the culture of academic integrity, and students will receive clear guidelines and rules regarding academic dishonesty as well as mechanisms for monitoring the implementation of these rules.

Based on the results of our study, we propose to monitor first-year students in order to study their attitudes towards academic dishonesty using the developed instrument. One of the advantages of the developed instrument that it is based on the Russian educational context and can be used in annual monitoring conducted by Russian universities.

Based on such monitoring, there will be determined which order(s) of criticism and justification individual groups of students, who refer to a certain order of worth of criticism and justification, follow. The results obtained during the application of the concept of L. Boltansky and L. Thevenot to the study of academic dishonesty of students allow us to form a pool of potential measures to combat academic dishonesty. They include the application of honor codes for students guided by the following regimes:

1. The order of inspiration, such students can be influenced through emotions, thus honor codes should inspire students, increase their interest in academic integrity;

2. The domestic order, for such students, the university should be the stage of socialization, at which the values of conscientious behavior are instilled;

3. The industrial order, it is important for such students that the honor codes contain provisions regarding the value of honest behavior for future professional activities. However, for students guided by other orders of criticism and justification, honor codes are not a relevant measure to reduce the prevalence of dishonesty. In such cases, they should only be used as an auxiliary tool. Therefore, we propose to test the effectiveness of the following measures:

4. If an order of fame prevails among students, it may be effective to harm students' reputation, for example by informing their classmates, lecturers, etc., that they have committed dishonest acts;

5. If a civic order prevails among students, it may be efficient to demonstrate the negative consequences of the dishonest behavior of one person for the whole group, for example, in case of cheating, all members of the group will have to complete additional assignments / tests, etc.;

6. If the market order prevails among students, then it is possible that strict control methods and sanctions will be effective for students, which will prevent them from easily achieving the goal at minimal costs.

However, these measures cannot be immediately incorporated into education policies. Their effectiveness and possible implications should to be explored in empirical studies with experimental design.

REFERENCES

1. Abou-Zeid, M. N. 2016. "Academic Integrity: A Perspective from Egypt." In *Handbook of Academic Integrity*, edited by T. Bretag, 135-45. Singapore: Springer.

2. Anderman, L. H., Freeman, T. M., & Mueller, C. E. (2007). The "social" side of social context: Interpersonal and affiliative dimensions of students' experiences and academic dishonesty. In *Psychology of academic cheating* (pp. 203-228). Academic Press.

3. Armitage, C. J., & Conner, M. (2001). Efficacy of the theory of planned behaviour: A meta-analytic review. *British journal of social psychology*, *40*(4), 471-499.

4. Bandura, A. (2002). Selective moral disengagement in the exercise of moral agency. *Journal of moral education*, *31*(2), 101-119.

5. Bandura, A. (2002). Social cognitive theory in cultural context. *Applied psychology*, *51*(2), 269-290.

6. Bandura, A. (2006). Adolescent development from an agentic perspective. *Selfefficacy beliefs of adolescents*, *5*, 1-43.

7. Baran L., Jonason P.K. (2020). Academic dishonesty among university students: The roles of the psychopathy, motivation, and self-efficacy. *PLoS ONE* 15(8): e0238141. doi: https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0238141

8. Bolin, A. U. (2004). Self-control, perceived opportunity, and attitudes as predictors of academic dishonesty. *The Journal of psychology*, *138*(2), 101-114.

9. Boltanski, L., & Thévenot, L. (1999). The sociology of critical capacity. *European journal of social theory*, *2*(3), 359-377.

10. Bourdieu, P. (2005). *The social structures of the economy*. Polity.

11. Bowers, W. (1964). Student dishonesty. *New York: Columbia Univ., Bureau of Applied Social Research*.

12. Brimble, M. (2016). Why students cheat: An exploration of the motivators of student academic dishonesty in higher education. *Handbook of academic integrity*, *365*.

13. Buckner, E., and R. Hodges. (2016). "Cheating or cheated? Surviving secondary exit exams in a neoliberal era." *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education* 46 (4): 603-623.

14. Burr V., King N. (2012). 'You're in Cruel England Now!': Teaching Research Ethics through Reality Television // Psychology Learning & Teaching. Vol. 11. №. 1. P. 22-29.

15. Cahill, S. P., Gallo, L. A., Lisman, S. A., & Weinstein, A. (2006). Willing or able? The meanings of self-efficacy. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 25(2), 196-209.

16. Chirikov, I., & Shmeleva, E. (2018). Are Russian students becoming more dishonest during college?. *Higher Education in Russia and Beyond*, 3(17), 19-21.

17. Chirikov, I., Shmeleva, E., & Loyalka, P. (2020). The role of faculty in reducing academic dishonesty among engineering students. *Studies in Higher Education*, *45*(12), 2464-2480.

18. Cizek, G. J., & Cizek, G. J. (2003). *Detecting and preventing classroom cheating: Promoting integrity in assessment*. Corwin Press.

19. Corrigan-Gibbs, H., Gupta, N., Northcutt, C., Cutrell, E., & Thies, W. (2015). Deterring cheating in online environments. ACM Transactions on ComputerHuman Interaction (TOCHI), 22(6), 1-23.

20. Cronan T. P., Mullins J. K., Douglas D. E. (2018) Further Understanding Factors that Explain Freshman Business Students' Academic Integrity Intention and Behavior: Plagiarism and Sharing Homework. *Journal of Business Ethics*. Vol. 147. No. 1. P. 197— 220. doi: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-015-2988-3.

21. Denisova-Schmidt, E. (2016). Academic dishonesty or corrupt values: The case of Russia. In *Corruption in Public Administration*. Edward Elgar Publishing.

22. Denisova-Schmidt, E., Huber, M., & Leontyeva, E. (2016). On the development of students' attitudes towards corruption and cheating in Russian universities. *European Journal of Higher Education*, *6*(2), 128-143.

23. Dix, E. L., Emery, L. F., & Le, B. (2014). Committed to the honor code: An investment model analysis of academic integrity. *Social Psychology of Education*, *17*(1), 179-196.

24. Doyle, E., Mullins, M., & Cunningham, M. (2010). Research ethics in a Business School context: The establishment of a review committee and the primary issues of concern. Journal of Academic Ethics, 8(1), 43-66.

25. Eastman, C., & Marzillier, J. S. (1984). Theoretical and methodological difficulties in Bandura's self-efficacy theory. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, *8*(3), 213-229.

26. Freiburger, T. L., D. M. Romain, B. M. Randol and C. D. Marcum. (2017). "Cheating Behaviours among Undergraduate College Students: Results from a Factorial Survey." *Journal of Criminal Justice Education* 28 (2), 222-247. doi: 10.1080/10511253.2016.1203010.

27. Ghanem, C. M., & Mozahem, N. A. (2019). A study of cheating beliefs, engagement, and perception–The case of business and engineering students. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, *17*(3), 291-312.

28. Hamlin, A., Barczyk, C., Powell, G., & Frost, J. (2013). A comparison of university efforts to contain academic dishonesty. *Journal of Legal, Ethical and Regulatory Issues*, *16*(1), 35.

29. Harding, T. S., Carpenter, D. D., Finelli, C. J., and H. J. Passow. (2004). "The influence of academic dishonesty on ethical decision making in the workplace: A study of engineering students". Proceedings of the ASEE Annual Conference and Exposition, Salt Lake City, UT.

30. Harper, R., Bretag, T., & Rundle, K. (2021). Detecting contract cheating: examining the role of assessment type. *Higher Education Research & Development*, *40*(2), 263-278.

31. Harrison, D., Patch, A., McNally, D., & Harris, L. (2020). Student and faculty perceptions of study helper websites: a new practice in collaborative cheating. *Journal of Academic Ethics,* 1-18.

32. Ives, B., & Giukin, L. (2020). Patterns and Predictors of Academic Dishonesty in Moldovan University Students. Journal of Academic Ethics, 18(1), 71-88.

33. Ives, B., Alama, M., Mosora, L. C., Mosora, M., Grosu-Radulescu, L., Clinciu, A. I., ... & Dutu, A. (2017). Patterns and predictors of academic dishonesty in Romanian university students. Higher Education, 74(5), 815-831.

34. Kanat-Maymon, Y., Benjamin, M., Stavsky, A., Shoshani, A., & Roth, G. (2015). The role of basic need fulfillment in academic dishonesty: A self-determination theory perspective. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, *43*, 1-9.

35. Karanauskienė, D., Česnaitienė, V. J., Miežienė, B., & Emeljanovas, A. (2020). Differences in Understanding Academic Integrity: A Lithuanian Case. In *Corruption in Higher Education* (pp. 25-29). Brill.

36. Kerkvliet, J., and C. L. Sigmund. (1999). "Can we control cheating in the classroom?". *The Journal of Economic Education* 30 (4): 331-343.

37. LaDuke, R. D. (2013). Academic dishonesty today, unethical practices tomorrow?. *Journal of Professional Nursing*, *29*(6), 402-406.

38. Löfström, E., Trotman, T., Furnari, M., & Shephard, K. (2015). Who teaches academic integrity and how do they teach it?. Higher Education, 69(3), 435-448.

39. Macdonald, R., & Carroll, J. (2006). Plagiarism—a complex issue requiring a holistic institutional approach. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, *31*(2), 233-245.

40. Magnus, J. R., Polterovich, V. M., Danilov, D. L., & Savvateev, A. V. (2002). Tolerance of cheating: An analysis across countries. The Journal of Economic Education, 33(2), 125–135.

41. Maloshonok, N., & Shmeleva, E. (2019). Factors influencing academic dishonesty among undergraduate students at Russian universities. Journal of Academic Ethics, 17(3), 313-329.

42. Matza, D., & Sykes, G. (1957). Techniques of neutralization: A theory of delinquency. *American Sociological Review*, *22*(6), 664-670.

43. McCabe D. L., Trevino L. K. (1993). Academic dishonesty: Honor codes and other contextual influences //The journal of higher education, Т. 64, №. 5. С. 522-538.

44. McCabe, D. L., & Pavela, G. (2004). Ten (updated) principles of academic integrity: How faculty can foster student honesty. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, *36*(3), 10-15.

45. McCabe, D. L., & Trevino, L. K. (1997). Individual and contextual influences on academic dishonesty: A multicampus investigation. *Research in higher education*, *38*(3), 379-396.

46. McCabe, D. L., Butterfield, K. D., & Trevino, L. K. (2006). Academic dishonesty in graduate business programs: Prevalence, causes, and proposed action. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, *5*(3), 294-305.

47. McCabe, D. L., Treviño, L. K., & Butterfield, K. D. (2001). Cheating in academic institutions: A decade of research. Ethics &Behavior, 11(3), 219-232.

48. Mezenin S. (2018). A Cheat Sheet Exhibition: Is It Promotion or Prevention of Cheating Among Students?. *Higher Education in Russia and Beyond*, 3(17), 21-22.

49. Miller A. D., Murdock T. B., Grotewiel M. M. (2017) Addressing Academic Dishonesty among the Highest Achievers. *Theory Into Practice.* 56 (2), 121—128. https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2017.1283574.

50. Milovanovitch, M. (2020). Academic Dishonesty: A Symptom, Not a Problem. In *Corruption in Higher Education*. Brill. 147-151. doi: https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004433885_022

51. Morgan, D. L. (2015). From themes to hypotheses: Following up with quantitative methods. *Qualitative health research*, *25*(6), 789-793.

52. Murdock, T. B., & Anderman, E. M. (2006). Motivational perspectives on student cheating: Toward an integrated model of academic dishonesty. *Educational psychologist*, *41*(3), 129-145.

53. Murdock, T. B., Hale, N. M., & Weber, M. J. (2001). Predictors of cheating among early adolescents: Academic and social motivations. *Contemporary educational psychology*, *26*(1), 96-115.

54. Murdock, T. B., Miller, A. D., & Goetzinger, A. (2007). Effects of classroom context on university students' judgments about cheating: Mediating and moderating processes. *Social Psychology of Education*, *10*(2), 141-169.

55. Nonis, S., & Swift, C. O. (2001). An examination of the relationship between academic dishonesty and workplace dishonesty: A multicampus investigation. *Journal of Education for business*, *77*(2), 69-77.

56. Preiss, M., Klein, H. A., Levenburg, N. M., & Nohavova, A. (2013). A crosscountry evaluation of cheating in academia—A comparison of data from the US and the Czech Republic. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, *11*(2), 157-167.

57. Pulfrey, C., Durussel, K., & Butera, F. (2018). The good cheat: Benevolence and the justification of collective cheating. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *110*(6), 764.

58. Pulvers K., Diekhoff G. M. (1999) The Relationship between Academic Dishonesty and College Classroom Environment. *Research in Higher Education.* Vol. 40. No. 4. P. 487—498. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1018792210076.

59. Raman, V., & Ramlogan, S. (2020). Academic integrity and the implementation of the honour code in the clinical training of undergraduate dental students. *International Journal for Educational Integrity*, *16*(1), 1-20.

60. Reshetar R., Pitts M. F. (2020) General Academic and Subject-Based Examinations Used in Undergraduate Higher Education Admissions. In: Oliveri M. E., Wendler C. (eds.) *Higher Education Admissions Practices: An International Perspective*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. P. 237—255. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108559607.014.

61. Shu, L. L., Gino, F., & Bazerman, M. H. (2011). Dishonest deed, clear conscience: When cheating leads to moral disengagement and motivated forgetting. *Personality and social psychology bulletin*, *37*(3), 330-349.

62. Solovyeva, A. (2018). Student Experience with Academic Dishonesty and Corruption in the Khabarovsk Region of Russia?. *Higher Education in Russia and Beyond*, 3(17), 9-11.

63. Starovoytova, D., & Arimi, M. (2017). Witnessing of Cheating-in-Exams Behavior and Factors Sustaining Integrity. *Journal of Education and Practice*, *8*(10), 127141.

64. Starovoytova, D., & Namango, S. (2016). Factors Affecting Cheating-Behavior at Undergraduate-Engineering. Journal of Education and Practice, 7(31), 66-82.

65. Stephens, J. M. (2019). Natural and normal, but unethical and evitable: The epidemic of academic dishonesty and how we end it. *Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning*, *51*(4), 8-17.

66. Susen, S. 2014. "Towards a Dialogue between Pierre Bourdieu's 'Critical Sociology' and Luc Boltanski's 'Pragmatic Sociology of Critique'." In: S. Susen

and B. S. Turner (Eds.), *The Spirit of Luc Boltanski: Essays on the 'Pragmatic Sociology of Critique'* 313- 348. London, UK: Anthem Press.

67. Sutherland-Smith, W. (2011). Crime and punishment: An analysis of university plagiarism policies.

68. Wagner, P. (1999). "After justification: Repertoires of evaluation and the sociology of modernity." *European Journal of Social Theory* 2 (3): 341-357. doi: 10.1177/13684319922224572.

69. Whitley, B. E., Jr., and Keith-Spiegel, P. (2002). Academic dishonesty: An educator's guide. Mahwah: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

70. Williams, D. M. (2010). Outcome expectancy and self-efficacy: Theoretical implications of an unresolved contradiction. *Personality and Social Psychology Review,* 14(4), 417-425.

71. Yang, S. C., Huang, C. L., & Chen, A. S. (2013). An investigation of college students' perceptions of academic dishonesty, reasons for dishonesty, achievement goals, and willingness to report dishonest behavior. *Ethics & Behavior*, *23*(6), 501522.

72. Yu, H., Glanzer, P. L., Johnson, B. R., Sriram, R., & Moore, B. (2018). Why college students cheat: A conceptual model of five factors. *The Review of Higher Education*, *41*(4), 549-576.

73. Yukhymenko-Lescroart, M. A. (2014). Ethical beliefs toward academic dishonesty: A cross-cultural comparison of undergraduate students in Ukraine and the United States. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, *12*(1), 29-41.

Publications in Russian:

74. Abakumova I. V., Ryadinskaya E. N., Golubova V. M. (2017). Systemic and structural analysis of theories of psychological transformations of personality. *Rossiiskii psikhologicheskii zhurnal - Russian Psychological Journal*, 14(1), 10-24.

75. Boltanski L. & L. Thevenot. (2013). Kritika i obosnovanie spravedlivosti: ocherki sociologii gradov [Critique and Justification of Justice: An Essays on the Sociology of Worlds], *Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie,* Moscow

76. Gertsen S. M. (2013). Measures of prevention of the academic fraud (from experience of foreign higher education institutions). *The Eurasian Scientific Journa*, 4 (17).

77. Golunov, S. V. (2010). Student plagiarism as a challenge for a higher education system in Russia and abroad. *Educational studies*, (3).

78. Efimova, G. Z., Kicherova, M. N. (2012). The analysis of the reasons of academic dishonesty and their classification. *Internet journal Naukovedenie*, 4 (13).

79. Efimova, G. Z. (2013). Academic dishonesty as a social problem: analysis of its main manifestations. *Siberian Journal of Life Sciences and Agriculture*, (1-3), 306322.

80. Kuzminov, Y. I. & Yudkevich, M. M. (2021). Universities in Russia: how it works. Moscow: Ed. the Higher School of Economics, 616.

81. Leontyeva, E. O. (2010). Standards and reality: is it possible to study according to the rules of Russian universities? *Educational studies*, (1), 208-225.

82. Makarova, M. N., & Vakhrushev, R. V. (2014). Anticorruption policy in higher education an new academic ethics. *Higher education in Russia*, (12), 55-63.

83. Maloshonok, N. G. (2016). Как восприятие академической честности среды университета взаимосвязано со студенческой вовлеченностью: возможности концептуализации и эмпирического изучения. *Educational studies*, (1), 35-60.

84. Maloshonok, N. G., Semenova, T. V., & Terentev, E. A. (2015). Academic Motivation among Students of Russian Higher Education Establishments: Introspection. *Educational studies,* (3), 92-121.

85. Radaev, V. V., & Chirikov, I. S. (2006). The Attitude of the students and the faculty to the penalties for plagiarism. *University Management: Practice and Analysis*, (4), 77-82.

86. Roshchina Y.M. (2013). The faculty of vocational education institutions in the market of educational services in 2010-2012. *Monitoring of the economics of education,* 8 (71).

87. Sivak, E. V. (2006). Crime in the audience. Determinants of dishonest behavior of students (plagiarism and cheating).

88. Harhordin O. V. (2007). Pragmatic turn: sociology of L. Boltanski and L. Thevenot. *Sociological studies*, 1, 32-41.

89. Shakhrai, S. M., Arister, N. I., & Tedeev, A. A. (2015). About plagiarism in PhD dissertations: scientific and methodological manual. Moscow. MII.

90. Shmeleva, E. D. (2015). Academic Dishonesty in Modern Universities: A Review of Theoretical Approaches and Empirical Findings. *Journal of Economic Sociology*, *16*(2), 55-79.

91. Shmeleva, E. D. (2016). Plagiarism and cheating in Russian universities: the role of the educational environment and students` individual characteristics. *Educational studies*, (1), 84-103.

92. Shmeleva E. D., Semenova T. V. 2019. Academic Dishonesty among College Students: Academic Motivation vs Contextual Factors. *Educational studies*, (3), 101–129.

APPENDIX

Table 1. The characteristics of the respondents who took part in the interviews

Country	University	Gender	Respondent
Russia	1	Male	№1, №2, №3
		Female	№4
	2	Male	№5, №6
		Female	№7, №8
	3	Male	№9, №10
		Female	№11
The UK	4	Male	№13, №12,
		Female	№14, №15
	5	Male	№16, №17
		Female	№18,№19
	6	Male	№20, №21
		Female	№22, №23

Table 2. Descriptive statistics of the student sample who participated in the study "Monitoring of student life"

Variables	%
Gender	
Male	39
Female	61
Year of study: undergraduate students	
first year	26
second year	22
third year	19
fourth year	17
fifth year	4
Year of study: graduate students	
first year	6
second year	6
Major	

Engineering and technology	54
Social sciences	27
Mathematics and natural sciences	19